THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) Glipizide is used in the treatment of diabeties.

(b) There is no known production of bulk drug Glipizide in the country.

(c) and (d) Yes, Sir.

(e) The requisite information has already been given in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 1322 answered on 5-12-1991.

(f) Yes, Sir.

(g) The inclusion/exclusion of bulk drugs under price control under DPCO, 1987 is mainly based on the recommendations made by the Kelkar Committee in its Main as well as Supplementary Report which were accepted by the then Government.

(h) and (i) The information sought for is voluminous. The time and labour involved in collecting the same will not be commensurate with the results likely to be achieved.

**List of Essential Drugs**

3054. DR. NARREDDY THULASI REDDY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the list of essential drugs for India has been prepared; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) and (b) For the purpose of price control, a list of 143 drugs falling under two categories (Category-I consisting of drugs used in National Health Programme and Category-II consisting of other drugs considered as essential) is being operated. This list is presently under review as part of review of Drug Policy.

**Grant of Stay to maintain price of Drugs**

3055. DR. RATNAKAR PANDEY: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what was the ground on which Delhi High Court granted stay to maintain prices in the case of Cyanamid V/s. Union of India;

(b) whether it is a fact that stay was granted on certain conditions; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) to (c) A copy of the Delhi High Court's order dated 25-11-81 in the case of Cynamid v/s. Union of India is enclosed in the statement.

**Statement**

Copy of an order dt. 25-11-81 passed by Hon'ble the Chief Justice and Hon'ble Mr. Justice B. N. Kirpal in C. M. No. 1153|81 in C.W. 820|81 re: M|s. Cynamid India Ltd. Vs. UOI etc.

Present: Mr. T. M. Ansari with Mr. S. H. Merchant for the petitioners.

Mrs. Vijaya Rao for the respondents.

C.M. 1153|81

After hearing learned counsel and with their consent, an arrangement has been worked out as an interim measure. We, therefore, confirm, till further orders the interim order made by us on April 20, 1981. The term of the said order are *i.e.* on the undertaking piven on behalf of the petitioner's to maintain *status quo* on the prices prevailing prior to the issue of the impunged notifications the petitioners throngh their counsel further given an undertaking to this court that, in case the petition is dismissed and the rule is discharged the petitioners shall within eight weeks of the dismissal of the petition by this court deposit in this court the difference in the price of the formulations in question for being ultimately deposited in the Drug Prices Equalisation Account. T petitioners through their counsel further given an undertaking that in this cuort the petitioners would not contend or challenge

the said amount, if deposited, is not liable to be deposited under any law whatsoever. It is made clear that the undertaking is without prejudice to the petitioner's right to take appropriate directions from the Supreme Court, if so advised in this regard.

2 As this matter is of great importance, not only for the bulk drugs and formulations in question but on the principle to be settled from the point of view of the consumers we expedite the hearing of this case and direct that the case be listed for hearing on February 1, 1982 along with Civil Writ No. 538 of 1981 and other Drug price control matters.

3. Respondents to file a detailed counter affadivit to the petition with a copy to counsel for the petitioners within four weeks. Rejoinder, if any, to be filed within two weeks thereafter.

4. Liberty to the petitioners to file compilation of documents with copy to counsel for the respondents. Liberty to the respondents to file an additional affidavit if necessary to explain compilation permitted to be filed. Liberty to petitioners to file rejoinder, if necessary, before the next date of hearing.

Sd/- PRAKASH NATH
Chief Justic

Sd/- B. N. KIRPAL
Judge

November 25, 1981

True Copy
Examiner

**Purchase of Certain Drugs**

3056. SHRIMATI PRATIBHA SINGH Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the editorial captioned "Break the Deadly Nexus" which appeared in the *Indian Express* of 25th October, 1991, if so, what steps Government have taken to examine the allegations;

(b) whether it is a fact that although certain formulations have furnished purchase invoices for purchase of Ibuprofen, Trimethoprim, Sulphamethaxazole, Metranidazone and several other drug to BICP and Government;



(c) if so, the details of purchase invoices, names of drugs, purchase prices indicated against each drug and the price recommended for each by BICP; and

(d) what are the names of drugs for which Government allowed price increases without calling of fresh data and evaluating the claims of cost escalation and what are the names of drugs for which benefit was not passed due to reduction in price?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI CHINTA MOHAN): (a) Government has seen the editorial captioned 'Break the Deadly Nexus' which appeared in the *Indian Express* on 25th October, 1991. The allegation that the Government has failed to regulate prices of drugs and formulations is not correct. In a situation of rising costs of inputs and changes in exchange rate of rupee, certain amount of increase in the prices of medicines is inevitable and reasonable price increases have to be allowed if shortages are to be prevented.

(b) and (c) While fixing the prices of formulations either the notified price or the purchase price of the bulk drug, whichever is lower, is taken into account.

(d) Government has increased the prices of 54 bulk drugs on *suo moto* basis to compensate the manufacturers for increase in input costs due to exchange rate adiustments.

The requisite information with regard to such bulk drugs whose prices have been reduced during 1991 has been provided in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred question No. 673 answered on 28-11-1991.

**Reviewing the Drugs (Price Control) Order**

3057. MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government propose to review the Drugs (Prices Control) Order to reduce the number of Drugs under price control and to revise the norms for fixing prices;